UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,825	09/30/2003	Reiner Hammerich	09700.0046-00	3059
	7590 06/18/200 AN, HENDERSON LI		EXAMINER	
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW			DAO, THUY CHAN	
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2192	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/676,825	HAMMERICH ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Thuy Dao	2192				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _03_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 M</u>	arch 2008					
•		action is non-final.					
′=	Since this application is in condition for allowar		secution as to the merits is				
٠,١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
- 4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,2,11,12 and 21-25</u> is/are pending in	the application					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>4 and 14</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
′=	Claim(s) <u>1,2,11,12 and 21-25</u> is/are rejected.						
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
•	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement					
		r oloolott roquitottionic.					
	on Papers						
-	The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on <u>30 September 2003</u> is/a	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	9 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
2)  Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte				

Art Unit: 2192

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on March 4, 2008.

2. Claims 1-2, 11-12, and 21-25 have been examined.

## **Response to Amendments**

3. In the instant amendments, claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended; claims 4 and 14 have been canceled; and claim 25 has been added.

## **Response to Arguments**

4. Applicants' arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## **Claim Objections**

5. Claim 24 (depending on claim 23) is objected to because of minor informalities. In the instant amendment, the Applicants added similar limitations recited in claim 24 to claim 23, and thus, make limitations recited in claim 24 appear redundant.

For the compact prosecution, claim 24 has been examined as presented.

Appropriate correction is requested in the next communication with the Office.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2192

7. Claims 1-2, 11-12, and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Publication No. 2004/0015840 A1 to Walker (art made of record, hereafter "Walker").

#### Claim 1:

Walker discloses a method for validating programs, the method comprising:

receiving a meta-language description of a computer program (e.g., [0022], XML representation of a Java class BookStore),

the meta-language description comprising a implementation module, the implementation module defining a first class to be implemented by the program (e.g., [0023] and [0021], XML description of class BookStore of a Java "book store" application) and

and an definition module, the definition module defining a first interface associated with the class (e.g., FIG. 4, block 410 → block 415 "Determine if XmlReaderWriter Interface Implemented?" → block 420 "Implemented"/YES: in said XML representation, said class BookStore associated with interface XmlReaderWriter);

validating the meta-language description (e.g., FIG. 5, block 505 → block 555 "Last XML Element? NO" → block 560 "Get Next XML Element", [0117]);

generating a language-dependent program from the meta-language description (e.g., FIG. 5, blocks 510, 540, and 550, [0112]-[0116]),

the language-dependent program comprising the first interface and the first class (e.g., [0024], [0038], [0086], Java class BookStore implementing the interface XmlReaderWriter); and

performing usage and semantic checks by compiling the generated first interface and the generated first class (e.g., [0021]-[0024], compiling said class and interface to obtain the executable of said Java "book store" application).

## Claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Walker discloses validating the metalanguage description comprises validating the syntax of the definition module and the

Art Unit: 2192

implementation module (e.g., FIG. 5, block 505 → block 555 "Last XML Element? NO"

→ block 560 "Get Next XML Element", [0117]).

Claims 11-12:

Claims 11-12 recite the same limitations as those of claims 1-2, wherein all

claimed limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the

reference teaches all of the limitations of the above claims, it also teaches all of the

limitations of claims 11-12.

Claim 21:

Claim 21 recites the same limitations as those of claim 1, wherein all claimed

limitations have been addressed and/or set forth above. Therefore, as the reference

teaches all of the limitations of the above claim, it also teaches all of the limitations of

claim 21.

Claim 22:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Walker discloses the language-

dependent program comprises a script code section written in a scripting language

(e.g., [0002]-[0003]).

Claim 23:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated. Walker discloses:

generating a compiler language representation of the script code section,

the compiler language representation of the script code section comprising a second

interface and a second class (e.g., [0061], [0069]); and

performing a semantics check of the script code section by compiling the

second interface and the second class (e.g., [0070]-[0071]).

Claim 24:

Art Unit: 2192

The rejection of claim 23 is incorporated. Walker discloses *performing usage and semantic checks by compiling the generated second interface and the generated second class* (e.g., [0072]-[0087]).

# Claim 25 (new):

The rejection of claim 22 is incorporated. Walker discloses:

performing a usage check on the script code section by: extracting language elements from the script code section (e.g., [0071]-[0083]); and

comparing the extracted language elements with the meta-language definition module (e.g., [0070] and [0084]-[0093]).

#### Conclusion

7. Applicants' amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Thuy Dao (Twee), whose telephone/fax numbers are (571) 272 8570 and (571) 273 8570, respectively. The examiner can normally be reached on every Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 6:00AM to 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached at (571) 272 3695.

Art Unit: 2192

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Thuy Dao/ Examiner, Art Unit 2192

/Tuan Q. Dam/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2192